

## REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

#### Claims 1-4

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Antoniadis in view of Onitsuka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 3 to recite the condition of no occurrence of a guided light that "wherein each of said EL layer and said transparent electrode has a film thickness (d) in which there is no occurrence of a guided light in terms of a wavelength of a light generated in said EL layer."

While Onitsuka teaches a wavelength of a light generated in the EL layer, i.e.  $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 520$  nm (see col. 18, ln. 35 in Onitsuka), none of the cited references (i.e. Antoniadis, Onitsuka, Shibata nor Codama) disclose or suggest the importance of setting film thickness of the EL layer and the transparent electrode in terms of a wavelength of a light generated in the EL layer. Hence, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Accordingly, the claims are patentable thereover, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Claims 5-12

The Examiner also rejects Claims 5-12 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Shibata et al. in view of Onitsuka et al., further in view of Codama and Arai. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

In order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 5, 7, 9 and 11 in a manner similar to that above to recite that “wherein each of said EL layer and said transparent electrode has a film thickness (d) in which there is no occurrence of a guided light in terms of a wavelength of a light generated in said EL layer.”

As explained above, none of the cited references (i.e. Antoniadis, Onitsuka, Shibata nor Codama) disclose or suggest the importance of setting film thickness of the EL layer and the transparent electrode in terms of a wavelength of a light generated in the EL layer. Hence, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Accordingly, the claims are patentable thereover, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are including herewith an IDS and request that the Examiner consider it prior to issuing any further action on this application. Please charge our deposit account 50/1039 for any further fee due for this IDS.

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in a condition for allowance, and accordingly, it is requested that it now be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 25, 2004

  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500